United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.1

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
12 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(*Item 3 (b)*)

Evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3)

1. At its fourth and fifth meetings, on 4 and 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and representatives of OIOS and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed appreciation for the OIOS report, noting its comprehensive nature and usefulness. A specific reference was made to the user-friendliness of the recommendations format utilized in the report.

4. Several delegations expressed their wish to utilize evaluation data to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the important work undertaken by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Furthermore, many delegations underscored the important work carried out by the Office with regard to the coordination of humanitarian responses; fundraising and managing of humanitarian response funds;

Please recycle

and the provision of support, in particular for the implementation of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee transformative agenda. At the same time, a few delegations sought clarification as to who had endorsed the transformative agenda.

5. As to the assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, clarification was sought by several delegations regarding the availability of performance data. Specifically, a number of delegations questioned why OIOS had not included a recommendation for a database to be developed if, as reflected in the OIOS report, "no single data source allows for quantification of the degree to which the international humanitarian system has improved efficiency, effectiveness or the final impact upon those affected by natural and man-made disasters".

6. Many delegations commented on the need to strengthen coordination between Inter-Agency Standing Committee partners in order to provide better humanitarian assistance. Harmonization in the United Nations system was also referred to by some delegations. A few delegations noted that a key area of the work of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs concerned close cooperation with host Governments based on humanitarian principles. Furthermore, queries were raised as to how coordination could be improved, particularly in the light of the comment in the OIOS report that "a number of stakeholders point to coordination within the United Nations as being complicated by systemic governance and accountability arrangements, at times being fragmented among entities with separate governing bodies and overlapping mandates that have differing approaches to the exercise of centralized or delegated authority".

7. A few delegations commented on the importance of the concept of resilience in humanitarian assistance. Moreover, they sought clarification on the role of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in resilience work and raised questions as to why the OIOS report did not include a recommendation on resilience.

8. Delegations noted the increasing need to provide humanitarian support in the context of disasters. In this regard, further clarification was requested regarding why there had been a decline in the percentage of funding for humanitarian assistance needs in official development assistance.

9. A few delegations also sought clarification regarding the extent to which the OIOS report identified a lack of clarity about the role of the regional offices of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and about what that Office and Member States should do to improve clarity. In addition, clarification was sought as to why, at the national level, the Humanitarian Coordinator was not a staff member of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Moreover, clarification was sought about the surge mechanisms and about the reasons why the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs did not have aggregate data on the timeliness of regional office surge deployment.

Conclusions and recommendations

10. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly take note of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3).**